

Zeitschrift: Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review

Band: 7 (1899)

Heft: 28

Artikel: Richard Hooker

Autor: Lias, J.J.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403461>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 01.02.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

RICHARD HOOKER.

It may be necessary to explain to Continental readers that among the number of Church of England Divines since the Reformation who have shed lustre on their Church by their learning and orthodoxy, and their profound acquaintance with the writings of the early Fathers two names stand conspicuous above all others. Not because they are so much more learned, or more eloquent, or more orthodox, or abler than the rest, but because they seem to have been accepted as exponents of the mind of the Reformed Church of England more completely than any others, as far at least as the works are concerned to which their fame is chiefly owing. These writers are Richard Hooker and John Pearson; and the treatises which have been practically adopted as the expression of her views by the Church of England at large are the *Ecclesiastical Polity* of the former and the volume on the Apostles' Creed, by the latter. Next to them in reputation as representative theologians of the English Church, come Lancelot Andrewes and Jeremy Taylor, and in very close proximity to these, George Bull. An acquaintance with these writers would give an excellent general idea of the tone and tendency of English theology as a whole. But it would be a very grave mistake to suppose that such a list was in the least degree exhaustive. Other Churches, it may be safely said, have scarcely the vaguest idea of the number of theologians of the first class which the English Church has produced during the last three centuries and a half. And even we in England are beginning to know less of them than we did. The "Catholic Revival", as it has been called, of 1833, in its protest against a certain Chauvinistic spirit which had grown up among members of our Church, and in its appeal

to a wider Catholicity than that of England, has unintentionally done injustice to our great theologians and has reduced them from their former perhaps exaggerated authority as a Court of Final Appeal our doctrinal on teaching, to a condition of insignificance which they have not deserved. History, however, is, to a very great extent, a chronicle of reactions. The Fathers of the English Church since the Reformation, though they may never regain the position from which they have been deposed, will certainly in the future recover some of the weight among us which they have lost. Their wisdom, their judgement, their moderation, their manliness, their erudition, their profound respect for Catholic antiquity, will entitle their opinions to the respect they deserve, a respect which, during the last thirty or forty years, they have hardly received in the Church to which they have done such inestimable service.

Richard Hooker, the subject of the present sketch, was born at Heavitree, near Exeter, in or about the year 1553—the first year, be it observed, of Queen Mary's reign. He would thus be about five years old at her death, and his earliest recollections would of course be coloured by the barbarities committed under her authority. The accession of Elizabeth put a stop for the time to religious persecution, and the impression made on the youthful mind of the great theologian would be one connecting the principles of the Reformation with toleration. Nor is it at all certain that this impression would be in any way corrected by the severe legislation against Popish recusants which characterized the later years of Elizabeth's reign. For the statutes against the recusants were but the reprisals of a Government which was fighting for its existence. When the Pope excommunicated Elizabeth; when he committed himself to the proposition that to "kill" an excommunicated heretic was "no murder"; it was clear to Elizabeth and her ministers that they had no alternative between the destruction of Elizabeth herself, her advisers, and her supporters, on the one hand, and on the other, the slaughter of those who were committed to so ferocious a policy as the Pope had proclaimed. Men like Richard Hooker must have grown up under the conviction that the only escape for themselves from being burnt for heresy, and for the whole nation from a cruel and degrading servitude, lay in the resolute prosecution of a policy of retaliation. Yet the gentle

spirit of Hooker must have lamented the sad necessity. His pages breathe no spirit of fierce antagonism to those to whom he is opposed. By sober reason, by friendly discussion, by loving persuasion, and now and then by playful banter, and by no other means than these, he sought to win men's adhesion to the Church he loved.

Even in his childhood Richard Hooker displayed the characteristics which afterwards made him famous. And this brought him very early under the notice of one who is himself a "household word" in the Church of England, the celebrated John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, the author of the well-known *Apology*, as well as of the challenge to the divines of the Roman Church which gave rise to it. Through Jewel's influence Hooker was sent to Oxford, where he entered Corpus Christi College in 1567, being then in his fifteenth year.

Hooker's biographer, Izaak Walton, a writer as celebrated as Hooker himself, though in a very different direction, tells a good many interesting anecdotes of this period of Hooker's life. But though they throw a good deal of light on the spirit of the age, they must be passed over here. Suffice it to say that in 1573 he was made scholar, in 1577 Fellow, of his College. In 1579 he was made reader in Hebrew in the University. Immediately afterwards he was expelled his College, for what reason is unknown. But in an appeal written by Dr Reynolds, one of his fellow-sufferers, to Sir Francis Knollys, it is stated that the expulsion was "for doing that which by oath we were bound to do". Within one month, however, they were reinstated, and this appears to be the only public insult which Hooker ever received.

His appointment as preacher at Paul's Cross in 1581 had a considerable influence on his after life. For he arrived in London, as Izaak Walton tells us "wet, weary, and weather-beaten", and "never", we are told, "was he known to express more passion" than to the friend who persuaded him to ride on horseback to London instead of going on foot. Mr Churchman, his host's wife, took such care of him in his forlorn condition that he was able to preach his sermon, in spite of all he had gone through. She told him he ought to have a wife. He, good simple man, imagined that he could do no better than take the advice, in so weighty a matter, of the woman who

had so effectually recovered him from his cold by the aid of sack possets and warm beds. She, naturally enough, recommended her own daughter, and poor Richard, who meekly espoused this treasure, found himself tied for life to a termagant who scolded him and ordered him about as long as he lived, and lighted the fire with the as yet unpublished portions of his immortal work after he was dead.

Thus was Richard Hooker introduced to “those corroding cares”, as Izaak Walton puts it, “which attend a married priest, and a country parsonage”. His former pupils, Edwin Sandys, son of the Archbishop of York, and George Cranmer, nephew of the martyred Archbishop of Canterbury, went down to see him in his Buckinghamshire living. They found him “tending sheep in a common field”, from which congenial occupation his wife than shortly summoned him to rock the cradle, and apparently seasoned her command with some of the compliments a scolding wife is apt to bestow on her husband. Anyhow Sandys and Cranmer found one day of the “Mistress Hooker” *ménage* quite enough for them. They left the next morning, condoling with their old tutor on his hard lot, and receiving an answer full of the sweetest contentment and patience. The incident deserves mention for the light it casts on the kind of character the Reformed Church of England tended at that time to produce—a product of that age, and it alone. It would have been alike impossible fifty years before, or fifty years after.

Sandys implored his father to release Hooker from labours and cares of so unsuitable a kind. Accordingly, he was made Master of the Temple in 1585. His appointment was, however, opposed by one Travers, Evening Preacher of the Temple, who, continuing in his post after Hooker’s appointment, attacked Hooker’s teaching. This, as well as the animadversions of Cartwright, Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, led to the publication of Hooker’s celebrated work on the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, the fullest and ablest defence of the Elizabethan settlement of religion which has ever appeared. As, however, Hooker grew “weary of the noise and oppositions of this place”—so he wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury—and as his “particular contests with Mr Travers” had “proved unpleasant to him”, he once more sought the retirement of a country living

But this time the living was enriched by the addition of a “prebend” at Salisbury Cathedral. There however, he did not stay very long, but was transferred to Bishopsbourne in Kent. In these two places he was enabled to finish the eight books of his immortal work. But as his wife allowed the three unpublished books to be destroyed, they had to be reconstructed after his death from a rough draft made by himself, as far as his friends found it possible to do so.

The reader must be referred to the pages of Izaak Walton for an account of the doings of this simplest and meekest of mankind. Suffice it here to say that he died about the year 1600, and that among the testimonies to the value of his writings is one from Pope Clement the Eighth, who told Dr Stapleton that in the books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* there were “such seeds of eternity” that “they shall last till the last fire consume all learning”.

A few words must be added to explain the circumstances which gave rise to the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. The reaction from Romanism which took place among men of ardent temperaments carried them far beyond the bounds of moderation. The persecutions of Mary’s reign, and the far more terrible atrocities perpetrated in the name of religion in France, in Spain, in the Low Countries, tended to deepen men’s hatred of the Papacy and all that was connected with it. These feelings were heightened by a dread of the overweening power of Spain, from subjection to which, it appeared to many Englishmen, their country had lately only escaped by the skin of its teeth. Thus a party came into existence, and particularly among men of the most intelligent and progressive minds, which was actuated by a fierce and even fanatical hatred of Rome. The Government, on the contrary, desired to pursue a middle course. Elizabeth’s position, as the daughter of Anne Boleyn, compelled her to maintain the legality of her father’s divorce from Queen Catharine, and thus to place herself in open opposition to the Pope. But she and her advisers aimed at reducing this opposition within as small a compass as possible. The safest plan appeared to be to treat all Mary’s legislation in regard to religion as null and void, to restore the legislation of Edward’s reign, and with it the later of his two Prayer Books, and to soften down the hostility to Rome as much as could be. Thus it was hoped

that the great mass of Englishmen would settle down quietly, and conform to the polity adopted in Church and State, and that the Government would thus be able to steer its way through the numerous dangers and perplexities by which it was environed.

Every reader of history knows how these hopes of a religious agreement were disappointed. Not only did the intrigues of the Papal party secure the secession of a considerable proportion of the nation to the Papacy, but the Puritans, as they were called, denounced the moderation of the religious settlement with equal heat and intemperance. Nothing, it contended, ought to be allowed to remain in the Church's Order of worship, which had been contaminated by being used in the worship of the apostate Church of Rome. Nothing ought to be required of Christian people in a Reformed Church, which was not directly prescribed in the Bible. Calvin had once scornfully described the provisions of the English Prayer Book as “*tolerabiles ineptiae*”. His disciples, caricaturing their master, as disciples are wont to do, inveighed against these same provisions as “*intolerabiles ineptiae*”. Resistance spread through the land. It invaded the Universities. Everywhere the altars were torn from their old position and placed in the body of the Church, and the communicants sat round them as if at an ordinary feast, passing the consecrated chalice one to another with a bow, “like good fellows”, as a complaint of the time quaintly phrases it, minister refused while the very often to wear the decent vestments prescribed in the *Order of Common Prayer*. These and other irregularities were reported to the Queen from all parts of the country, and even from the Universities themselves. In vain did she issue *Advertisements* for the repression of these irregularities. In vain did she punish, and sometimes punish severely, those who committed them. The resistance still continued. The convictions of the offenders were too deeply rooted to allow them to give way. Thomas Cartwright, a learned, eloquent, and able man, at one time Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, placed himself at the head of the opposition, and attacked the doctrine, discipline, and administration of the Church of England in two addresses to Parliament, called the First and Second Admonitions. These were followed, after a while, by the “Book of Discipline”, which not only

emphasized the attacks on the Church system, but boldly proposed the substitution of the Presbyterian system in its place. The storm raged for nearly thirty years. Archbishop Whitgift prevailed on the Queen to establish a Court of High Commission, with full powers to put down all disobedience to the law of the Church. This caused a violent outburst of indignation, which took the form of pasquinades known as the “Marpreate Libels”. These turned the Prayer Book, the whole bench of Bishops, and the conforming clergy, into ridicule in the coarsest language.

The “Marpreate Libels” form the high water mark of the Puritan agitation during the reign of Elizabeth. The libels were answered in a similar spirit and tone, but with infinitely more wit, by a dramatist named Nash. This turned the tide among the vulgar. Then, again, a generation had been born and bred under the new *régime*, and the English Prayer Book had begun to lay a hold on the reverence and affection of Englishmen which it has never since lost. And the calm and measured reasoning of Hooker in favour of the “ecclesiastical polity” established by law in this country—his first four books appeared in 1594—finally convinced all moderate men that the angry and libellous attacks on the Book of Common Prayer had no foundation, except in prejudice. Even as early as 1586 the Houses of Parliament had refused to substitute Cartwright’s Book of Discipline for the Book of Common Prayer. In 1593 Parliament passed some very stringent measures for the suppression of the Puritan agitation. There seems good reason to believe that it would have died out altogether, but for the exasperating policy in Church and State alike which was adopted after the accession of James I in 1603.

The *Ecclesiastical Polity* of Hooker was no more passing endeavour to meet a temporary need. It has been felt ever since to be a justification in the eyes of future ages of the wisdom and soundness of the Elizabethan settlement. Hooker laid his foundations broad and strong in the eternal fitness of things. In his first book he discusses the foundation of law as laid in the Being of God, in the constitution of nature, and in the needs of man. In the second he inquires whether it is reasonable to expect that all laws, of whatever kind, for the guidance of man, should be expressly laid down by Scripture. In the third book he asks whether the laws by which the

Church was governed when the New Testament was written are necessarily binding for all time. In the fourth he discusses the alleged impropriety of maintaining in a reformed Church, any customs whatever which had existed in the corrupt Church of Rome. The fifth book is devoted to the discussion of particular objections to the Book of Common Prayer as it existed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The sixth book treats of the fountain of spiritual jurisdiction in the Church of England. The seventh treats of Episcopal authority. The eighth and last deals with the supreme authority of princes. Of these books, the fifth gives most information concerning the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, and the principles embodied in that doctrine and discipline. The three last books, as has already been stated, were not written by Hooker, but were compiled after his death, from sundry notes which he had left behind him.

The extracts which follow will give an idea of the principles of the Reformed Church of England, according to one who has more than any one else, been accepted as a satisfactory exponent of those principles.

In regard to the sufficiency of Scripture he tells us:—

Two opinions therefore there are concerning sufficiency of Holy Scripture, each extremely opposite unto the other, and both repugnant unto truth. The schools of Rome teach Scripture to be so unsufficient, as if, except traditions were added, it did not contain all revealed and supernatural truth, which absolutely is necessary for the children of men in this life to know that they may in the next be saved. Others justly condemning this opinion grow likewise unto a dangerous extremity, as if Scripture did not only contain all things in that kind necessary, but all things simply, and in such sort that to do anything according to any other law were not only unnecessary but even opposite unto salvation, unlawful and sinful. Whatsoever is spoken of God or things appertaining to God otherwise than as the truth is; though it seem an honour, it is an injury. And as incredible praises given unto men do often abate and impair the credit of their deserved condemnation; so we must likewise take great need, lest in attributing unto Scripture more than it can have, the incredibility of that do cause even those things which indeed it hath most abundantly to be less reverently esteemed. I therefore leave it to themselves to consider, whether they have in this first point or not overshot themselves; which God doth know is quickly done, even

when our meaning is most sincere, as I am verily persuaded theirs in this case was. (Book II. VIII. 7.)

In regard to matters of pious opinion in the Church he writes:—

Touching matters belonging unto the Church of Christ this we conceive, that they are not of one suit. Some things are merely of faith, which things it doth suffice that we know and believe; some things not only to be known but done, because they concern the actions of men. Articles about the Trinity are matters of mere faith, and must be believed. Precepts concerning the works of charity are matters of action; which to know, unless they be practised, is not enough. This being so clear to all men's understanding, I somewhat marvel that they especially should think it absurd to oppose Church government, a plain matter of action, unto matters of faith, who know that themselves divide the Gospel into Doctrine and Discipline. For if matters of discipline be rightly by them distinguished from matters of doctrine, why not matters of government by us as reasonably set against matters of faith? Do not they under discipline comprise the regiment of the Church? When they blame that in us which themselves follow, they give men great cause to doubt that some other thing than judgment doth guide their speech. (III. III. 2.)

On the effects of allowing no authority to the Church he says:—

As therefore in controversies between us and the Church of Rome, that which they practise is many times even according to the very grossness of that which the vulgar sort conceiveth; when that which they teach to maintain it is so nice and subtile that hold can very hardly be taken thereupon; in which cases we should do the Church of God small benefit by disputing with them according unto the finest points of their dark conveyances, and suffering that sense of their doctrine to go uncontrolled, wherein by the common sort it is ordinarily received and practised; so considering what disturbance hath grown in the Church amongst ourselves, and how the authors thereof do commonly build altogether on this as a sure foundation, "Nothing ought to be established in the Church which in the word of God is not commanded"; were it reason that we should suffer the same to pass without controlment in that current meaning whereby everywhere it prevaleth, and stay till some strange construction were made thereof, which no man would lightly have thought on but being driven thereunto for a shift? (III. VII. 5.)

He remarks in regard to what is and what is not to be expected in Scripture:—

Fourthly, and to make manifest that from Scripture we offer not to derogate the least thing that truth thereunto doth claim, in as much as by us it is willingly confessed, that the Scripture of God is a storehouse abounding with inestimable treasures of wisdom and knowledge in many kinds, over and above things in this one kind barely necessary; yea, even that matters of ecclesiastical polity are not therein omitted, but taught also, albeit not so taught as those other things before mentioned. For so perfectly are those things taught, that nothing can ever need to be added, nothing ever cease to be necessary; these on the contrary side, as being of a far other nature and quality, not so strictly nor everlastingly commanded in Scripture, but that unto the complete form of church polity much may be requisite which the Scripture teacheth not, and much which it hath taught become un requisite, sometime because we need not use it, sometime also because we cannot. In which respect for mine own part, although I see that certain reformed churches, the Scottish especially and French, have not that which best agreeth with the sacred Scripture, I mean the government that is by Bishops, in as much as both those churches are fallen under a different kind of regiment; which to remedy it is for the one altogether too late, and too soon for the other during their present affliction and trouble; this their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in such case than exagitate, considering that men oftentimes without any fault of their own may be driven to want that kind of polity or regiment which is best, and to content themselves with that, which either the irremediable error of former times, or the necessity of the present hath cast upon them. (III. xi. 16.)

On the question whether we ought to reject a ceremony because it is to be found in the Church of Rome he says:—

The rites and orders wherein we follow the Church of Rome are of no other kind than such as the church of Geneva itself doth follow them in. We follow the church of Rome in more things; yet they in some things of the same nature about which our present controversy is: so that the difference is not in the kind, but in the number of rites only, wherein they and we do follow the church of Rome. The use of wafer-cakes, the custom of godfathers and godmothers in baptism, are things not commanded nor forbidden in Scripture, things which have been of old and are retained in the church of Rome even at this very hour. Is conformity with

Rome in such things a blemish unto the church of England, and unto churches abroad an ornament? Let them, if not for the reverence they owe unto this church, in the bowels whereof they have received I trust that precious and blessed vigour, which shall quicken them to eternal life, yet at the least wise for the singular affection which they do bear towards others, take heed how they strike, lest they wound whom they would not. For undoubtedly it cutteth deeper than they are aware of, when they plead that even such ceremonies of the church of Rome, as contain in them nothing which is not of itself agreeable to the word of God, ought nevertheless to be abolished; and that neither the word of God, nor reason, nor the examples of the eldest churches do permit the church of Rome to be therein followed. (IV. vi. 1.)

He thus defends the use of the surplice in public worship:—

The honesty, dignity, and estimation of white apparel in the eastern part of the world, is a token of greater fitness for this sacred use, wherein it were not convenient that any thing basely thought of should be suffered. Notwithstanding I am not bent to stand stiffly upon these probabilities, that in Jerome's and Chrysostom's time any such attire was made several to this purpose. Yet surely the words of Solomon are very impertinent to prove it an ornament therefore not several for the ministers to execute their ministry in, because men of credit and estimation were their ordinary apparel white. For we know that when Solomon wrote those words, the several apparel for the ministers of the Law to execute their ministry in was such. (V, xxix. 3.)

And he speaks thus of the Sacraments:—

As oft as we mention a Sacrament properly understood (for in the writings of the ancient Fathers all articles which are peculiar to Christian faith, all duties of religion containing that which sense or natural reason cannot of itself discern, are most commonly named Sacraments), our restraint of the word to some few principal divine ceremonies importeth in every such ceremony two things, the substance of the ceremony itself which is visible, and besides that somewhat else more secret in reference whereunto we conceive that ceremony to be a Sacrament. For we all admire and honour the holy Sacraments, not respecting so much the service which we do unto God in receiving them, as the dignity of that sacred and secret gift which we thereby receive from God. Seeing that Sacraments therefore consist altogether in relation to some such gift or grace supernatural as only God can bestow,

how should any but the Church administer those ceremonies as Sacraments which are not thought to be Sacraments by any but by the Church? (V. I. 2.)

It is to be noted that Hooker understands far more clearly than most Anglican writers the truth that the virtue of the Sacraments is directly derived from the fact of the Incarnation. I must refer my readers to the book itself for Hooker's masterly treatment of that great fundamental doctrine. It will be a great surprise to every one who only knows of Anglican teaching by report. He notes how the first four Oecumenical Councils have been instrumental in bringing out, four-square, as it were, the four principle aspects of the Hypostatic Union, as expressed in the four words *ἀληγωσις, τελεωσις, ἀδιαιρέτωσις, ἀσυγχύτωσις* (Book V. iv. 10). And he repudiates as "too cold an interpretation" any conception of the Divine indwelling of Christ in us which limits it to the possession by Him of the "selfsame nature" as ours.

"We are therefore adopted sons of God to eternal life *by participation of the only begotten Son of God, Whose Life is the well-spring and cause of ours*" (Book V. vi. 7).

It is by the full acceptance of this great principle of the indwelling of the Incarnate Son of God in each of the members of His Church that Hooker shews himself to have imbibed the true Catholic principles of the theology of the fourth Century. Western theologians have allowed the doctrine of the Divine immanence to be obscured, and sometimes altogether superseded, by a doctrine which regards God as external to the soul, and as influencing it by the intermittent action of a principle called grace, which is given when asked for, and at other times, apparently, withheld. And so it has happened that popular Roman theology has come to look on God as a potentate, and on the whole an angry potentate, to be disarmed by submission, and popular Protestant theology to seek for an inward conviction of reconciliation with Him, as the only test of acceptance. Theology of the latter kind has obtained far too strong a hold on the popular mind in England. But if it have done so, it is at least not owing to the influence of the most universally recognized teacher in the English Church.

In regard to the relative functions performed by Baptism and the Eucharist, Hooker says:—

“We receive Jesus Christ in baptism once as the first beginner, in the Eucharist often as being by continual degrees the finisher of our life.” (Book V. vii. 6.¹)

In dealing with the attempts to explain away our Lord’s words “born of water and the Spirit”, he lays down the following admirable *dictum*:—

“I hold it for a most infallible rule in exposition of Sacred Scripture, that where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst.” (Book V. ix. 2.)

He has not failed to perceive the practical unanimity in regard to the nature of the gift in the Eucharist, as distinguished from the manner of its conveyance, which exists among the great majority of Christians. He finds, by “opening the several opinions which have been held”, that “they are grown for aught I can see on all sides at the length to a general agreement concerning that which alone is material, namely the *real participation* of Christ and of life in his body and blood *by means of this sacrament*”.²) And he asks “wherefore should the world continue still distracted and rent with so manifold contentions, when there remaineth now no controversy saving only about the subject *where Christ is*”. (V. xvii. 2.) All that remains doubtful, he adds, is “whether, when the Sacrament is administered Christ be whole *within man only*, or else His body and blood be also externally seated in the very consecrated elements themselves”. I must refer the reader to the work itself for the eloquent words in which he urges a more loving toleration of diversity of opinion on this subject, winding up with the (to Englishmen) well known words—though, alas! too little heeded, “Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, ‘O my God thou art true, O my soul, thou art happy?’” (V. xvii. 12.)

One passage, however, may be quoted as illustrative of his method of treating the subject.

Take therefore that wherein all agree, and then consider by itself what cause why the rest in question should not rather be left as superfluous than urged as necessary. It is on all sides plainly confessed, first that this sacrament is a true and a real

¹) See also XVII. 1.

²) The Italics are Hooker’s.

participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth himself even his whole entire Person *as a mystical Head* unto every soul that receiveth him, and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ as *a mystical member of him*, yea of them also whom he acknowledgeth to be his own; secondly that to whom *the person of Christ* is thus communicated, to them he giveth by the same sacrament his Holy Spirit to sanctify them as it sanctifieth him which is their head; thirdly that what *merit, force or virtue soever there is in his sacrificed body and blood*, we freely, fully and wholly have it by this sacrament; fourthly that *the effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies* from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortality and life; fifthly that because the sacrament being of itself but a corruptible and earthly creature must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we are therefore to rest ourselves altogether upon *the strength of his glorious power* who is able and will bring to pass that the bread and cup which he giveth us shall be truly the thing he promiseth. (V. VIII. 7.)

The utterance of Hooker's on this point which has given rise to most controversy in our Church, especially of late years, consists of the words "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be looked for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament." (V. XVII. 6.) It is easy to see that here he, like a good many other persons since, has fallen into a confusion of thought between the *Sacrament* and the *elements*. It is strange that such a confusion of thought should ever have taken place, since in the other Sacrament no one ever confuses the Sacrament of Baptism with element of water. In the Eucharist the *Sacrament* consists in the doing with the elements of bread and wine what Christ has commanded; and no instructed Christian, certainly not Hooker himself, doubts that there is a presence of Christ in the whole rite. *This* is not the point which is so hotly debated, as Hooker himself reminds us, but whether the Divine Presence enters the soul in consequence of obedience to the rite ordained by Christ, or whether it is received *in and through* the elements. Into this controversy we will not enter, but only express a hope that, as the years roll on, Hooker's advice will be more widely taken; that men will leave off disputing on the how and the why, and restrict their thoughts to the blessed fact

that in this Sacrament Christ really gives Himself to His faithful people.

The rest of the work must be dismissed more briefly. As the reader already knows, it is not the work of Hooker himself, but was drawn up from notes he left behind him. The sixth book deals with the Presbyterian system of lay elders, which the Puritans desired to substitute for Episcopacy in England. Herein the subject of penitential discipline is discussed in the light of Scripture and primitive tradition. Some readers of this paper may be unaware that the Puritans succeeded in setting up in Scotland the form of discipline they recommended in England; that it has not been a conspicuous success; that it has been much modified in practice of late; and that it bids fair to disappear altogether. The teaching of the early Church and of the Schoolmen on Confession and Satisfaction are passed in careful review, and of “private and secret confession” we are told (VI. iv. 3) that “being thus made a thing both general and also necessary, the next degree of estimation whereunto it grew, was to be honoured and lifted up into the nature of a sacrament; that as Christ did institute Baptism to give life, and the Eucharist to nourish life, so Penitency might be thought a Sacrament ordained to recover life, and Confession a part of the Sacrament”.

Book VII is not less worthy of careful study than Book VI. But it must suffice to quote Hooker’s definition of a Bishop, and to remark that, while he recognizes a general right in the Episcopate at large to govern the Church without the restraint of each Bishop to a particular diocese, he urges the manifold convenience of such restriction in the interests of Church work; and that he pursues with wide erudition the history of Episcopal authority through its various ramifications and developments, down to the Church constitution set up in England under Queen Elizabeth. His definition of a Bishop is as follows:—

“A Bishop is a minister of God, unto whom with permanent continuance there is given not only power of ministering the Word and Sacraments, which power other presbyters have, but also a power to ordain ecclesiastical persons, and a power of chiefty in government over Presbyters as well as Laymen, a power to be by way of jurisdiction a Pastor even to Pastors themselves.” (VII. iii. 1.)

The last book deals with the proper functions of the civil power in matters ecclesiastical.

It may be well to subjoin Hooker's teaching on Justification, from his second sermon, from which it will appear that he was not in accord with Calvin on this point.

We have already showed, that there are two kinds of Christian righteousness: the one without us, which we have by imputation: the other in us, which consisteth of faith, hope, charity, and other Christian virtues; and St. James doth prove that Abraham had not only the one, because the thing he believed was imputed unto him for righteousness; but also the other, because he offered up his son. God giveth us both the one justice and the other: the one by accepting us for righteous in Christ; the other by working Christian righteousness in us. The proper and most immediate efficient cause in us of this latter, is the spirit of adoption which we have received into our hearts. That whereof it consisteth, whereof it is really and formally made, are those infused virtues proper and particular unto saints; which the spirit, in that very moment when first it is given of God, bringeth with it: the effects thereof are such actions as the Apostle doth call the fruits, the works, the operations from the Spirit; the difference of which operations from the root whereof they spring, maketh it needful to put two kinds likewise of sanctifying righteousness, Habitual and Actual. Habitual, that holiness, wherewith our souls are inwardly indued, the same instant when first we begin to be the temples of the Holy Ghost; Actual, that holiness which afterward beautifieth all the parts and actions of our life, the holiness for which Enoch, Job, Zachary, Elizabeth, and other saints, are in Scriptures so highly commended. If here it be demanded, which of these we do first receive: I answer, that the Spirit, the virtues of the Spirit, the habitual justice, which is ingrafted, the external justice of Christ Jesus which is imputed, these we receive all at one and the same time; whosoever we have any of these, we have all; they go together. Yet sith no man is justified except he believe, and no man believeth except he have faith, and no man hath faith, unless he have received the Spirit of Adoption, for as much as these do necessarily infer justification, but justification doth of necessity presuppose them; we must needs hold that imputed righteousness, in dignity being the chiefest, is notwithstanding in order the last of all these, but actual righteousness, which is the righteousness of good works, succeedeth all, followeth after all, both in order and in time.

As to Predestination, the controversy between him and Travers clearly proves that his doctrine was not acceptable to the Puritan or Calvinist party. In fact Hooker was the founder of what has been called the Anglo-Catholic school of theology in the English Church. During the confusions and troubles of the reigns of Edward and Mary, and the early part of that of Elizabeth, Anglican doctrine was in solution, as it were. Men's instincts inclined in favour of a Reformed Catholicism, but the influence of Calvin was strong among the public teachers of religion. What is known among us as Anglo-Catholicism first took shape, and very definite shape, in the writings of Hooker. And it has ever since been the dominant theological school in the Church of England.

J. J. LIAS.
